

MATP-607US

Appln. No.: 10/021,426  
Amendment Dated November 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2005

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 10, 12-13, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Klausner et al. and Kikinis. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 7 and 13. With regard to claim 1, neither Klausner et al., Kikinis, nor their combination disclose or suggest an integrated receiver/decoder (IRD) set top box comprising a processor that stores messages, which include the received audio messages and the text representation of the DTMF tones into the storage device and provides the stored text representation of the DTMF tones **directly** to the video processing circuitry for display on the display device. (Emphasis added). Basis for this amendment may be found in the specification at paragraphs 0031 and 0036 and in Figure 1.

Klausner et al. is described in the previous response. In Klausner et al., the information is displayed on a dedicated display of the telephone answering device (TAD) itself. The information is not processed in order to be displayed on a television display device. Further, the invention in Klausner et al. does not include video processing circuitry for processing demodulated television signals. Thus, the information is not provided to this video processing circuitry for display on a display device.

Kikinis teaches an Electronic Document Answering Machine which is adapted to connect to remote information sources, to download digital documents including e-mail and web pages, and to store the documents for later review by a user. In Kikinis, the information must go through the tuner in the television receiver. Thus, the user must tune to a specific channel to view the information. (Col. 7, lines 23-25 and Fig. 5). Because the present invention, as defined by claim 1, requires a processor that provides text directly to the video processing circuitry, it allows the user to view the messages without tuning to a specific channel; the messages may be displayed on any channel, using the video processing circuitry of the receiver.

Because neither Klausner et al. nor Kikinis disclose or suggest limitation of claim 1 that the processor which stores the text representation of the DTMF tones also provides the text directly to video signal processing circuitry, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al. and Kikinis. Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4 and 6 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al. and Kikinis.

MATP-607US

Appln. No.: 10/021,426  
Amendment Dated November 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2005

Claim 7, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 7 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 10 and 12 depend from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 10 and 12 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al. and Kikinis.

Claim 13, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. In particular, neither Klausner et al., Kikinis nor their combination discloses or suggests processing stored text representations of DTMF tones **with demodulated television signals** for display on a display device. Thus, claim 13 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 16 and 18 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, claims 16 and 18 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al. and Kikinis.

Claims 2-3, 5, 8-9, 11, 14-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Klausner et al. and Kikinis and McNutt et al. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 7 and 13 described above. Kikinis is described above. Klausner et al. and McNutt et al. are described in the previous response. McNutt et al. also do not disclose or suggest an integrated receiver/decoder (IRD) set top box comprising a processor that stores messages, which include the received audio messages and the text representation of the DTMF tones into the storage device and provides the stored text representation of the DTMF tones **directly** to the video processing circuitry for display on the display device or which processes the text representations of the DTMF tones **with the demodulated television signals** for display on the display device.

Claims 2-3 and 5 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-3 and 5 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al., Kikinis and McNutt et al. Claims 8-9 and 11 depend from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 8-9 and 11 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al., Kikinis and McNutt et al. Claims 14-15 and 17 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, claims 14-15 and 17 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Klausner et al., Kikinis and McNutt et al.


The prior art made of record but not applied has been considered but does not affect the patentability of the invention.

MATP-607US

Appln. No.: 10/021,426  
Amendment Dated November 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2005

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-18.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549  
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/jal

Dated: November 22, 2005

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via Facsimile Transmission to Facsimile No. 1-571-273-8300 addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:  
November 22, 2005

  
Juli Lawrence

JAL\_1:\MKPA\107US\10.05.05AMEND.DOC